IV. REMARKS

1. Claims 1-4, 6-13, 15, and 16 remain in the application. Claims 5, 14, and 17 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 2, and 12 have been amended.

2. The Title has been amended to correct typographical errors.

3. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-4, 6-13, 15 and 16 are not anticipated by Rhodes et al. (GB 2 369 750, "Rhodes") under 35 USC 102(b).

In response to Applicant's previous arguments, the Examiner states that the features upon which Applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claims. In order to facilitate further prosecution of the subject case the independent claims have been amended such that these features now are incorporated in the pending independent claims. Further, Applicant welcomes any suggestion the Examiner may have regarding moving the case towards being in condition for allowance.

As previously submitted, Rhodes relates to disambiguation software using a dictionary stored in the memory of a data communications device. The Examiner states that Rhodes teaches a controller to receive a composed text message inputted from the keypad. In contrast, the receiver as currently claimed receives items of textual information contained in an incoming text message. This limitation is not taught or otherwise suggested by Rhodes.

Currently amended claim 1 thus discloses a data processor operable in response to received items of textual information, the textual information being contained in an incoming text message, to automatically extract textual information directly from the incoming text message.

Rhodes discloses that the disambiguation software is applied for disambiguating text entries (e.g. names, geographic locations) in an address book. Particularly, Rhodes at page 10, lines 20-26 (as explicitly cited by the Examiner) teaches the ambiguous key sequence to be stored in a memory together with a pointer which points to the memory address location in the SIM card corresponding to the newly stored text item in the address book. There is absolutely no suggestion in Rhodes that textual information from a received text message can be used to supplement the disambiguating software dictionary. Furthermore, it is nowhere suggested that such textual information might be extracted directly from an incoming message.

Furthermore, when comparing Rhodes and to the instant disclosure it is clear that a "text message" of the instant claims cannot be considered equivalent to the textual input of Rhodes. For example, Fig. 6 of Applicant's disclosure discloses "received" communication contains textual information. This feature is not found in Rhodes which instead relates to a message being "composed" using user input. The skilled person would understand the reception of a text message, such as an SMS message or an e-mail to mean the delivery of such a message to the recipient, and be different from the entry of the message's content by the sender.

In conclusion, Rhodes does not teach the features defined by the amended claims. The present amended independent claims are therefore patentable over Rhodes.

At least for these reasons, Applicants submit that Rhodes does not anticipate independent claims 1 and 12 and dependent claims 2-4, 6-11, 13, 15 and 16.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph V. Gamberdell, Jr. — 10 July 2009
Joseph V. Gamberdell, Jr. Date
Reg. No. 44,695

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800
Customer No.: 2512